

## CHAPTER THREE:

### ALTERNATIVES



Photo courtesy of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### INTRODUCTION

From December 2005 through April 2006, the NPS conducted a number of interviews, scoping meetings, and team meetings to develop a reasonable range of alternatives for the proposed Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT. These consultations and team meetings included groups with a range of interests in the proposed trail: county, city, state, and federal agencies; politicians; historians; potential trail users; historic, natural, and cultural resource managers; and tourism officials. See Chapter Six for more information on Consultation and Coordination. Through the process of developing the significance statement and trail purpose statement, the groups identified opportunities and constraints associated with trail designation and development. These issues were then synthesized by the study team into proposed designation alternatives.

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE FOR THE TRAIL

The purpose of the proposed Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT is to commemorate the exploratory voyages of Captain Smith on the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries in 1607-1609, in association with the founding of Jamestown, the first permanent British colony in North America. It would also recognize the American Indian towns and culture of the seventeenth century, call

attention to the natural history of the Bay (both historic and contemporary), complement the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network, and provide new opportunities for education, recreation, and heritage tourism in the Chesapeake Bay region. In providing a focus on and appreciation of the resources associated with Smith's voyages, the trail would help to facilitate protection of those resources.

The proposed trail traces John Smith's several voyages on the York and James Rivers in 1607, and his two major voyages around the Chesapeake Bay during the summer of 1608, both of which started from Jamestown and headed out the James River into the Bay. On the first 1608 voyage, he traveled north along the eastern shore, exploring the mouth of the Pocomoke River and traveling some distance up the Nanticoke River. He continued north on the Bay as far as present-day Baltimore and the Patapsco River, then headed south along the western shore, exploring the Potomac (Patowomeck) and some of its tributaries to a point north of present-day Washington, DC, before returning to Jamestown. On the second voyage, Smith went straight up the Bay to the mouth of the Susquehanna and present-day Havre de Grace, exploring the Patuxent and Rappahannock Rivers on his return trip southward. The proposed trail would be a circuit of the Bay, with river extensions, combining the routes of all of these historic voyages.

---

## **Management Issues— A Vision Statement**

The study team developed the following statements to describe desired future conditions for the trail, including visitor experience, resource conditions, and management. Many of these statements reflect experience gained administering other national historic trails nationwide:

### **Visitor Experience**

- The public gains an enhanced appreciation for Captain John Smith's two major voyages of exploration around the Chesapeake Bay during the summer of 1608.
- The Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT is primarily a commemorative water trail to be experienced via watercraft and accessed by existing water access sites.
- Visitors can also view the trail setting and learn the stories from the land, by visiting selected land sites where interpretation can be appropriately provided in proximity to the voyage routes.
- The Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT has adequate and appropriate public use and interpretive facilities, and access points.
- The Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT ties many historic, cultural, and natural resources together to interpret and commemorate the stories associated with it.
- Several hubs along the trail serve as main interpretive and orientation points for visitors.
- Resources along the trail receive special designation when they meet criteria established for the trail.
- A coherent, well-designed water trail guide provides interpretation and information for water trail users.
- A coherent, well-designed information and interpretive program, which can be accessed electronically from specialized buoys developed by NOAA is effective in directing watercraft users along the trail and in interpreting the stories.

### **Resource Protection**

- Cultural and natural resources associated with the trail are protected and interpreted in perpetuity.
- Ongoing research is conducted to explore the archeology and extant cultural resources associated with the trail.
- A Cultural Landscape Report is prepared and informs implementation planning
- Linkages between land access sites and water portions of the trail are made in an environmentally sensitive manner.
- A coherent, well-designed information and interpretive signage program is effective in keeping trail users away from environmentally sensitive areas and fragile historic resources.
- Currently unprotected resources that are found to be significant are appropriately protected through available preservation mechanisms at the local, state, and federal level.

### **Administration and Management**

- A partnership among the local communities, state government, and federal government is responsible for the management of trail sites and connecting waterways.
- A trail comprehensive management plan is developed and implemented, as required by the National Trails System Act.
- A management entity is established to provide administrative and oversight duties.
- Formalized agreements exist between the NPS and the authorities who hold jurisdiction over the roads and rights-of-way of the trail and associated resources.
- Landowners and resource managers play an integral role in decision-making regarding trail use and development.
- Identified funding and support mechanisms exist to implement the trail comprehensive management plan.
- Linkages between roads, water, and resources are created and maintained as much as possible through cooperative agreements, conservation easements, and other means.

---

### **Achieving the Vision**

To achieve this vision and to fully address key trail management issues, the following management responsibilities must be addressed :

- Trailwide administration, coordination, and oversight
- Right-of-way protection for the trail access points
- Inventory of resources
- Resource protection and monitoring
- Monitoring and adapting appropriate visitor uses (carrying capacity, cultural and environmental sensitivity)
- Close coordination and collaboration with local government planning and land use management to maintain integrity and visitor experience
- Interpretation of cultural and natural resources
- Development of facilities (physical improvements along the trail including access, parking, waysides, pull-offs, utilities, etc)
- Trail marking and signs
- Production, oversight, and distribution of trail maps, site bulletins, and websites
- Maintenance of trail right-of-way, facilities, and exhibits
- Enforcement of resource protection standards and local laws
- Liability and indemnification of landowners

### **Alternatives and Analysis of Management Considerations**

This is a feasibility study, not a management plan, for the proposed Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT. Part of the feasibility and desirability assessment of a NHT concerns how and by whom it will be run, if established. This feasibility study evaluates various options for the administration of the proposed trail. As required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the NPS planning process requires the development, analysis, and public review of different solutions, or “alternatives,” for accomplishing planning goals while minimizing negative impacts on the environment. A reasonable range of alternatives must be developed, including a baseline alternative,



Photo courtesy of Carolyn Marlow

or "No Action Alternative." This creates a baseline of existing conditions and impacts against which the impacts of the action alternatives can be compared. The action alternatives should examine potential federal involvement and other management concepts that achieve similar goals.

The project team considered two action alternatives: (1) federal designation of a NHT and (2) multi-state (non-federal) establishment of a commemorative trail. These action alternatives and the no-action alternative are discussed below.

---

## Measures Common to All Action Alternatives

All of the action alternatives strive for the recognition and commemoration of the Captain John Smith voyages of 1607-1609. The different alternatives focus on varying degrees of federal involvement and describe the implications for resource protection, interpretation, visitor experience and management and operations of the proposed national historic trail and its associated resources. The action alternatives seek to:

- Protect and interpret the historic routes and cultural resources associated with the historic routes, American Indian heritage, exploration of the Chesapeake Bay and the establishment of English settlements.
- Commemorate significant exploration cultural interaction events and the individuals associated with those events.
- Recognize, interpret, and protect sites associated with the historic routes.
- Allow visitors to envision and experience the heritage and struggles that ensued during explorations of 1607-1609.
- Recognize the individuals who explored with or encountered Captain Smith to serve as a reminder of the significance of the exploration, both in terms of impact on native inhabitants and as symbols of the spirit of adventure and wonder associated with exploration.
- Protect private property rights.
- Capitalize on water recreation access to much of the Chesapeake Bay, its shoreline, and tidewater tributaries.
- Provide interpretive and recreational opportunities for visitors to learn about the stories of the Captain John Smith voyages.
- Provide a unique visitor experience through a commemorative water route and driving tours that explore many different themes.
- Provide resource protection and interpretation with minimal construction or site disturbance.

- Provide resource management and interpretation based on thorough professional research and scholarship.
- Encourage preservation of both private and public resources related to the history of the trail.

## Alternative A: No Action (Continuation of Existing Policies and Authorities)

Under no action, there would be no federal designation of a NHT. Without federal designation of the proposed Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT, existing actions of agencies, organizations, and individuals could continue their various approaches to the protection and interpretation of resources associated with Captain Smith's voyages. There would not be an overarching agency or private management entity directed to help coordinate, interpret, and protect resources and segments of the proposed trail. Trail segments and individual resources would continue to be managed individually by a variety of state and local entities. There would be no coordinated recognition or administration outside of existing state programs focused on managing and interpreting the entire two thousand miles of potential trail associated with Captain Smith's explorations. National recognition of the significance of Smith's travels and the impact of the exploration upon American Indians, British domination of the region, and European settlement would only be recognized in a piecemeal fashion.

Water trails developed by Maryland and Virginia and programs of the CBGN would be the primary vehicles for telling the stories related to the trail and marketing the resources to the general public. The states, Colonial NHP and the Gateways Network would implement their trail and interpretive activities focusing on parts of the John Smith story in the context of broader Chesapeake Bay and American Colonial themes. The state trails would not be required to meet NHT criteria.





Photo courtesy of Tom Boddorff

Individual trail segments and resources would continue to be managed, developed, interpreted, used, marked, maintained, and enforced by interested agencies, groups, and property owners. Under no action, it is likely that public access would be limited to those sites now in public ownership. Existing preservation mechanisms would likely remain in place but, given the currently shrinking budgets and staff of most state and local governments and non-governmental organizations, it is likely that few additional easements would be acquired and that few or no new actions would be taken to protect other significant resources. State and county laws for historic preservation, shoreline protection, and private property rights would apply. County-level planning would continue to balance preservation of historic and cultural resources with the realities of development and shoreline access.

Existing interpretive programs would continue. Under this no-action alternative, the CBGN may continue to provide the broadest geographic and thematic system of Bay-related sites and resource interpretation in the Chesapeake watershed. The Gateways

Network's many independently managed partner sites would likely continue to enhance interpretation and public access and set examples for Bay stewardship, depending upon available funds and priorities. NOAA would continue to install interpretive buoys.

The current regional and national attention to Captain John Smith would cease for many decades after the events associated with the 400th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown are completed. There would be no additional federal funding for this alternative.

### **Alternative B: Federal Designation as a National Historic Trail (The NPS Preferred Alternative)**

**Trail Administration**—Under this alternative, the Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT would be established by the United States Congress as a NHT and administered by the NPS. This federal role, based on the administrative authorities of the National Trails System Act, includes coordination of resource protection and trail route marking, general oversight and promotion, interagency consultations,

---

cooperative agreements, support of volunteers, inventorying of high potential sites and segments, coordination of interpretive themes and media, compliance, certification of appropriate sites and segments, provision of limited financial assistance (when such funds are available), and support of the trail's advisory council. If Congress designates the proposed trail as a NHT, this study recommends that NPS administer the trail for the following reasons:

- The NPS already has an administrative presence in the Chesapeake Bay area, provided by the Chesapeake Bay Program Office, Colonial National Historical Park, Jamestown National Historic Site, and the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail.
- NPS has strong knowledge of and interpretive background in telling the story of Captain John Smith and of the Chesapeake Bay in general.
- NPS has an in-depth capacity to support pre-history, history, and archeological projects.
- NPS has a demonstrated track record of successfully administering NHTs and currently is involved in the administration of fourteen of the sixteen NHTs nationwide. Several of these (especially the Trail of Tears and Lewis and Clark NHTs) are largely made up of water trail routes.
- A variety of NPS programs are essential to the full cultural resource operations of national historic trails. These include the National Register of Historic Places, National Historic Landmarks, Historic American Landscape Survey, Federal Archeological Assistance, and Teaching with Historic Places.

**Trail Management**—As trail administrator, the NPS would coordinate closely with other federal agencies, in particular the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wildlife Refuge System (FWS) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) interpretive buoy project, as well as state and

local agencies, to coordinate consistent on-the-ground management to make the trail and its various routes and public sites fully available to the public. NPS, through the comprehensive management plan, would determine more precisely the various jurisdictions' roles in resource inventory, protection and monitoring; enforcement; proper use; interpretation; facility development; and maintenance.

**Nonprofit Partnership**—NPS experience with other national trails indicates that a successful trail also needs the involvement of one or more nonprofit trail organizations. In close and long-term coordination with federal and state agencies, counties and municipalities, tribal organizations, landowners, and other interested parties, such a group assists in the long-term planning, maintenance, volunteer recruitment, interpretation, trail and resource protection, and development along the trail's routes and sites. Without such a group as a partner, it has proven difficult to fulfill the potential of any national trail. With such a group in place and functioning in close partnership with the trail's administering office, national trails have proven to be cost-effective, efficient, and public-spirited investments.

**Trail Access and Resource Protection**—All existing federal, state, and local laws would apply to users of the trail and to owners of property in proximity to the trail. While the federal government would not actively seek to acquire trail access sites or other resources, it could work with consenting owners should resources become available. If willing sellers present opportunities to protect significant trail segments and resources, then federal, state, local and/or non-profit organizations may be used to acquire them. For trail-related resources not owned by local, state or federal government, nor protected by a non-profit organization, efforts would be made to encourage the trail organization, state and local governments, and other private and non-profit entities to enter into cooperative agreements and/or obtain easements, rights-of-way, and land in fee for the

---

protection and public access to the trail site or segment.

The partner organization would encourage cooperative agreements with landowners to certify trail resources as a part of the national trail while maintaining private ownership. Certification would help assure the public that access sites are qualified historic sites and that protection, interpretation, and facilities meet the standards of significance and quality that would be expected for a nationally designated trail. Private property owners and resource managers would be eligible for technical and any available financial assistance from the trail organization and/or the NPS. While no federal fee-simple acquisition of trail-related sites or associated resources is now envisioned, the federal government could acquire land and/or preservation easements, based on the comprehensive management plan, through dedications, donation, or purchase from willing sellers to protect significant trail segments, viewsheds, and resources.

#### **Trail Marking and Interpretation—**

Over time, certified resources along the trail, as well water access points and the trail itself, would be marked with a uniform trail marker (established during the comprehensive management planning process) and would be made accessible to the public. Where feasible and desirable, roads that parallel the historic routes could be marked as an auto tour route to provide non-boaters the ability to experience the trail. In cases where the original voyage stops have been lost to development, degradation, neglect, vegetative overgrowth, or other causes, they could be interpreted through wayside exhibits as appropriate and feasible.

Additions to the trail that are of significant public interest may be interpreted and managed as state or local jurisdiction side trails. These non-federal resources may be certified in the future as part of the National Historic Trail should they meet the national significance criteria themes developed as a component of the comprehensive management plan.

Under this alternative, a Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT would build upon and be supported by the CBGN. In recent years the CBGN has made important strides in helping people experience the Bay and become personally involved in its stewardship. The Gateways Network is currently authorized through 2008 and subject to annual appropriations.

The existing CBGN is an extensive and successful partnership of parks, refuges, maritime museums, historic sites and water trails around the Bay watershed. The NPS provides overall guidance and coordination of the Gateways Network in coordination with the Gateways Network Working Group. The Working Group—composed of representatives of the Chesapeake Bay Program, the natural resources, historic resources and tourism agencies of Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia (including the state programs that support water trail development), federal agencies managing designated Gateways, and key private sector Bay organizations—would provide an established group of stakeholders that could be instrumental in the development of the trail comprehensive management plan and might evolve to fulfill the necessary trail support organization roles.

The CBGN would continue to provide the broadest geographic and thematic system of Bay-related sites and resource interpretation in the Chesapeake watershed. The NPS would continue to coordinate the Gateways Network and provide technical and financial assistance to designated Gateways and water trails, while the sites and trails would still be managed by a variety of local, state and federal agencies and non-governmental organizations. The Gateways Network's many independently managed partner sites would continue to enhance interpretation and public access to Bay-related land and water resources and set examples for Bay stewardship. A comprehensive web site and an annual map and guide would continue to provide comprehensive interpretation of Chesapeake stories and

---

empower visitors to find their way to Chesapeake destinations.

Initial federal costs to develop the comprehensive management plan required by this alternative and an initial interpretive brochure are estimated to be \$400 thousand. Phased costs such as access site development, interpretive sign development and installation, and any necessary archaeological surveys are unknown at this time and will be estimated during the comprehensive management planning process. It is anticipated that these costs will be the responsibility of the trail partners.

**Potential Impacts of National Trail Designation on Privately Owned Land and Water**—The legislation authorizing this study called for “an extensive analysis of the potential impacts the designation of the trail as a national historic watertrail is likely to have on land and water, including docks and piers, along the proposed route or bordering the study route that is privately owned at the time of the study.” Given existing levels of recreational boating on the Bay and experience with other NHT, it is not expected that designation will result in a significant increase in boating.

None of the water in the Chesapeake Bay or its tributaries is privately owned. It is all under the jurisdiction of the bordering states. If the trail is designated a national trail, this would not change.

Recreational boating is a major activity on the Bay and its tributaries and is a key factor in the economic health of the bordering states. For example, Maryland currently has over 200,000 registered and documented boats. In addition, it is estimated that there are over 26,000 transient recreational vessels that use Maryland’s waterways on an annual basis. Annually, recreational boating generates over \$2 billion in Maryland, making it an important factor in the state’s overall economy. Virginia has 246,000 active boat registrations. In Virginia, new boat sales and equipment was worth \$397 million, which is only a partial

accounting of expenditures generated by recreational boating.

The states have fostered the use and enjoyment of their rivers and bays, especially through the development of public boating access sites and facilities. The states have partnered with local governments and nonprofit organizations to leverage and secure additional state and federal water access funding through programs such as Recreational Trails, Transportation Enhancements and the CDBG. Since the 1960s, for example, Maryland has developed over 290 publicly owned boating facilities on federal, state, and locally owned lands that serve both trailered and non-trailered boats. Maryland also has approximately three hundred privately owned boating facilities, bringing the total number of boating facilities to nearly six hundred throughout the state. Virginia has 220 private marinas providing water access in the Bay area, and 233 publicly owned tidal access sites.

Boating activities on the Bay include the use of power, sail, and non-motorized boats. Of these, power boats are the most predominant; however, the use of non-motorized boats such as kayaks and canoes is becoming increasingly popular. In addition to recreational boating, sport and commercial fishing by boat are prevalent throughout the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, and they also contribute significantly to the states’ economies.

Since the late 1990s, major water trails have been developed along several of the major tributaries to the Chesapeake Bay. Since 1999, Maryland’s Department of Natural Resources has focused on creating a water trails network, now consisting of over 450 miles of coastline in and around the Chesapeake Bay to complement its existing network of public lands along the Bay. Virginia has nine designated water trail systems totaling 467 miles.

In addition, the 2000 Chesapeake Bay Agreement set goals for establishing new water trails and improving boating access. Through partnerships among local governments, non-





Photo courtesy of Sara Lewis

profit organizations, and citizen associations, water trails can be effective in helping to protect and enhance local waterways while simultaneously providing a tourist attraction and a magnet for economic development. To that end, the establishment of the Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT would be consistent with the states' goals to promote the development of water trails. Portions of the proposed John Smith Trail will coincide with several water trails that already exist in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.

The extensive number of existing public and private boating facilities around the Bay shoreline (see Map 11) could be used to support the proposed trail. This includes public and private boat ramps, piers, landings, marinas, marked navigation channels, and protected anchorages. Furthermore, many services that can support users of the proposed trail are already located throughout the Bay including wet slips, boat ramps, boat repair facilities, restaurants, restrooms, fuel docks, marine

sewage pumpout stations, utilities, and recycling stations.

The majority of the water trails and public and private boating facilities in and around the Chesapeake Bay are located in areas that are adjacent to private properties. Boating activities in these areas include power and sailboat cruising, water skiing, crabbing, fishing, as well as paddle boating. Boating activities in general have minimal adverse impacts on local waterfront property owners, particularly as long as boaters obey laws and regulations regarding trespassing, wakes, noise, and littering. However, there are several actions that can be taken under various laws, regulations, policy and planning authorities currently in place to help ensure that the proposed trail will not contribute to adverse impacts on adjacent private properties.

The states work with the public daily to provide safety on state waterways. Problems with speeding, overcrowding and/or conges-

tion can be addressed in a number of ways. In areas where problems are consistent and pose significant safety issues, regulations creating speed zones may be necessary. The general public can request regulating a waterway by petitioning the state in accordance with established procedures. In addition, the state can recommend minimum or no wake zones for all or portions of a waterway if determined appropriate. The state can also impose enforcement actions on vessels that exceed regulated noise and speed limits on state waterways.

With respect to trespassing issues on private property, there are isolated instances where boaters may congregate on points of land with safe anchorages or stop along a shoreline to stretch their legs. However, the number of complaints received by the states regarding trespassing issues fronting on tidal waters is minimal. This is part due to the significant number of public and private boating access areas that are located throughout the Chesapeake Bay. It is anticipated that the proposed trail will not significantly increase the instances of trespassing on private properties.

As for the potential impact on future development along the proposed trail, designation of the trail will not have any impact on the existing state and federal regulatory processes regarding dredging or the maintenance/construction of marinas, docks, piers, slips, boat ramps or shoreline protection on private or public lands.

Additional actions to help minimize any impacts of the proposed trail on private property owners would include providing educational programs and information to the public that will encourage responsible boating; clearly defining where users can and cannot exit their watercraft; promoting “Leave No Trace” principles; educating communities about the economic benefits of the trail; and establishing signs, interpretive displays, and brochures/maps for the public. Such programs and initiatives, along with the identification of potential



funding sources for the trail, will be addressed in the Comprehensive Management Plan if the trail is designated and will include the opportunity for input by federal, state, and local agencies as well as the general public.

There is an extensive number of public and private boating facilities located throughout the Chesapeake Bay. This existing infrastructure is available to support boating activities including those associated with the proposed Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT.

The states have sufficient laws and regulations in place that can address issues that may arise as a result of boat traffic along the trail.

The trail will not place any additional requirements on property owners who want to dredge or maintain or construct marinas, piers, docks, slips, boat ramps or shoreline protection.

In light of the above, this study has determined there will not be a significant impact on private properties as a result of establishing the Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT.

---

### **Alternative C: Multi-State Designation as a Commemorative Trail**

Under this alternative, the states may designate a Captain John Smith commemorative trail or series of trails, with associated resources to be managed by the states (MD, VA, DC, PA, DE) or a commission or a private entity. This designation is not recognized under the National Trails System Act and would not be a federal designation or a national trail. The trail could be one entire trail or a series of state designated trails, which may later qualify for designation as a National Recreation Trail(s). The trail and its resources would be owned and managed by state and local governments or private entities, not by the federal government. A local management entity could be created that would develop a comprehensive plan, including strategies for natural and cultural resource protection and interpretation.

The local management entity(s) would be responsible for the long-term planning, management, oversight, interpretation, trail and resource protection, and development along the historic routes. A non-profit trail organization could be established and, in coordination with the states and counties, would assume responsibilities as necessary.

Over time, the routes would be marked as continuous trail segments along the water's edge. Wherever feasible, modern roads that follow the historic routes would be marked for travel for those without access to watercraft. In cases where the original voyage stops have

been lost to development, degradation, neglect, or vegetative overgrowth, or other causes, they could be interpreted through waysides, as appropriate and feasible. No additional land or resources would be acquired for the trail. For the portions of the trail not owned by the state or federal government, state and local governments and other private entities would be encouraged to enter into cooperative agreements and obtain easements, rights-of-way, and land in fee for the protection and permanency of the trail. Responsible agencies would encourage cooperative agreements with landowners to certify trail segments and resources as a part of the trail while maintaining private ownership. Certification would help assure the public that sites and segments are qualified historic sites and that protection, interpretation, and facilities meet state standards.

Given current state budget constraints, Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia may not have sufficient resources to undertake a major coordinated initiative without federal support.

### **Selection of Environmentally Preferred Alternative**

Alternative B, Federal Designation as a National Historic Trail with Joint Management is the environmentally preferred alternative because it provides the greatest degree of resource protection and enhanced visitor experience while allowing for individual property rights, diverse land uses, and balance between the existing population and the creation of a National Historic Trail.

## Summary of Alternatives

	<b>Alternative A: No Action</b>	<b>Alternative B: Federal Designation as National Historic Trail (NHT)</b>	<b>Alternative C: Multi-State Designation as a Commemorative Trail</b>
<b>Concept</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuation of existing policies and authorities</li> <li>A disconnected series of resources with no linkages</li> <li>No single agency or management entity directed to coordinate, protect, and interpret the associated trail resources and segments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A federally-designated water trail around the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, approximating the historic routes of John Smith's 1608 voyages, with sites to be selected on land providing interpretation and public access</li> <li>Planned for and managed through a partnership among the federal government, one or more trail organizations, state and local governments</li> <li>NPS administrates &amp; coordinates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No NHT designation</li> <li>No designated federal money, no NPS management</li> <li>The states can designate a John Smith commemorative trail, with associated resources to be managed by the states (MD, VA, DC, PA, DE) or a commission or a private entity</li> <li>The trail can be one entire trail or a series of state designated trails, which may later qualify for designation as National Recreation Trails</li> </ul>
<b>Resource Protection</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Piecemeal resource protection on a case-by-case basis as development or threats occur</li> <li>State and local governmental authorities responsible for monitoring development and enforcing regulations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NPS, in partnership with federal, state and local agencies, develops a comprehensive management plan (CMP) that identifies selected sites that support public access and interpretation and identifies needed resource protection strategies</li> <li>State and local land use laws and regulations apply</li> <li>Technical and financial assistance provided by NPS</li> <li>No additional federal regulatory actions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State and local land use laws and regulations apply</li> <li>Resources are acquired and/or managed by state and local governments with or without a non-profit partner</li> </ul>
<b>Interpretation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interpretation of the historic John Smith voyages and explorations of the Chesapeake Bay by various state &amp; local agencies &amp; NGOs with no unified interpretation</li> <li>Continuation of existing interpretation at various federal, state, local and private sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NPS and partners cooperate to develop a management plan (CMP) that establishes an interpretive plan and themes, and provides for coordinated interpretation through individual resources and a trail guide</li> <li>A wide variety of media and interpretive devices orient visitors to experience the trail (potentially including the NOAA buoy project)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primarily coordinated through local efforts with some financial support from the states</li> <li>Reliance on individual resources</li> <li>Provide coordinated interpretation through individual resources</li> <li>States work together to establish themes and interpretation</li> </ul>



## Summary of Alternatives continued

	<b>Alternative A: No Action</b>	<b>Alternative B: Federal Designation as National Historic Trail (NHT)</b>	<b>Alternative C: Multi-State Designation as a Commemorative Trail</b>
<b>Visitor Experience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilities provided at existing public parks and museums</li> <li>No single itinerary for visitors; reliance on individual resources, states of Maryland and Virginia</li> <li>The Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network would continue to provide the broadest geographic and thematic system of Bay-related sites and resource interpretation in the Chesapeake watershed—through 2008</li> <li>The Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network would continue to provide the broadest geographic and thematic system of Bay-related sites and resource interpretation in the Chesapeake watershed—through 2008</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visitors experience the trail from the water along the approximated route of Smith’s voyages, and from selected shoreline sites that provide access or information</li> <li>Visitors experience the trail through appropriate access points and modes, and interpretive materials and devices are provided to promote public understanding and appreciation of the trail and the John Smith voyages</li> <li>The trail would build upon and be supported by the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network which would continue to provide the broadest geographic and thematic system of Bay-related sites and resource interpretation in the Chesapeake watershed. The Gateways Network would continue to provide technical and financial assistance to designated Gateways and water trails.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visitors are oriented at sites established by the states</li> </ul>
<b>Administration and Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State and local governments and private entities continue to manage individual sites</li> <li>No trailwide coordination</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NPS coordinates a CMP planning process which involves federal, state, and local agencies, landowners, and site managers</li> <li>NPS provides technical and financial assistance</li> <li>State and local agencies play a major role in a cooperative management strategy</li> <li>NPS and partners develop a plan that identifies a trail management entity that NPS works with in the implementation of the plan</li> <li>The plan outlines resource protection, interpretation, operation and maintenance of the trail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any or all of the states of Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia would determine a joint management approach</li> <li>No trailwide NPS administration</li> </ul>